

Date: Tue, 13 Sep 94 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #440
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 13 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 440

Today's Topics:

 dah-di-dah-dit dah-dah-di-dah
Morse code as a common language? (was Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an
 re-name this group (2 msgs)
 Sum'tin for nut'in an
Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 10 Sep 1994 11:53:37 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
jobone!news1.oakland.edu!vela.acs.oakland.edu!prvalko@ames.arpa
Subject: dah-di-dah-dit dah-dah-di-dah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:
: Cecil Moore <cecilmoores@delphi.com> writes:

: >dah-dah-di-dah di-dah-dit dah-dah-di-dit di-di-dah-dah-di-dit
:

:-. .. --- -- -.- -.- ... ----.

: .--. .-.. ... -.- ... -.- - - . -.-

Hmmm.... Am I the only person here that senses a "chirpy" signal above?
=paul= wb8zjl

Date: 12 Sep 1994 01:53:20 GMT
From: mozo.cc.purdue.edu!rain!mconner@purdue.edu
Subject: Morse code as a common language? (was Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Sep10.231348.10424@egreen.wednet.edu> jmollan@egreen.iclnet.org
(John Mollan - Harm) writes:
>r r BT cw vy FB fer qso.
>BTW, wx hr 60C es windy.
>tnx om, cul
>73,

Hope you're in the air conditioning - 140F is a rather toasty day.
Or is someone on a DXpedition to the Libyan desert?

Shoot, even temperature isn't expressed as a common "language"
worldwide.

--
Mark D. Conner - N9XTN Opinions expressed here are
Dept. of Earth & Atmospheric Sciences not necessarily those of the
Purdue Univ., W. Lafayette IN 47907 Government, DoD, Purdue, or
mconner@rain.atms.purdue.edu the author.

Date: 12 Sep 1994 20:20:01 -0400
From: agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!nic-
nac.CSU.net!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!swiss.ans.net!
newstf01.cr1.aol.com!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: re-name this group
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Re-name this group rec.radio.cw.flamewars

Date: 13 Sep 1994 02:09:24 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!kennish@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: re-name this group
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <352r7h\$9e6@search01.news.aol.com>, Sailou <sailou@aol.com> wrote:
> Re-name this group rec.radio.cw.flamewars

I couldn't agree more. In the past week, there have been over 350 messages, of which less than 10 had to do with sumtin' other than CW. Geez, there are other important issues with respect to amateur radio other than CW.... Let's get with it guys (and gals).

==ken

Date: 10 Sep 1994 06:31:05 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!fallout!cmoore@ames.arpa
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in an
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gregory brown (gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu) wrote:

: Danke sehr fur so interessante radio Vervindung.
: Mahalo nui loa no he lealea radio walaau
: Dakka per kaelega fyrir skemmtilegt samtál.
: Banjak terima kasih atas hubungan radio jang sangat menarik.
: Molte grazie per un contatto radio veramente interessante.

So if this was encoded into Morse code, I would understand it?
I'm developing a new appreciation for CW. I'm going to go try it right now. DXCC-CW, here I come.

73, KG7BK, 00TC, Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com (No hablo para Intel)

Date: Mon, 12 Sep 1994 18:14:49 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!news.cs.utah.edu!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <3505rh\$8av@jupiter.planet.net>, Bill Sohl Budd Lake (billsohl@earth.planet.net) writes:

>Michael Silva (mjsilva@ted.win.net) wrote:

>: >What is wrong with the proposal of opening the HF Phone bands to people
>: >who pass 5wpm CW and are capable of passing all the written tests through
>: >extra class? This would certainly reverse the dumbing-down of ham radio and
>: >would not be encroaching on your precious CW bands. Some might even grow
>: >to like CW, like I do, and pass the 13wpm test later for CW priviledges.

>: >
>: What purpose is served by allowing these engineering wizards access to
>: HF phone? Is HF phone really the cutting edge? How are they going to
>: apply their engineering talents there? Seems to me that they'd just be
>: wasting time jawboning when they should be applying their technical
>: prowess, which gained them their special entry status, by expanding the
>: frontiers of the hobby, which are VHF/UHF/SHF. But wait, don't we
>: already **have** a license for that?

>

>: Furthermore, it really makes no sense to pass a CW test to get access
>: to band segments where nobody is working CW.

>: Mike, KK6GM

>

>Which is exactly the point that several of us have been espousing...

>why have a 13/20 wpm CW requirement for HF band segments where CW

>is not the mode being used?

>

Over and over I have replied: With the exception of the Novice class, which is severely limited and was intended to be merely a temporary arrangement, **we are licensed for bands, not subbands**. Whatever you did with your ham radios yesterday, I'm sure I could show that you didn't need 3/4 of the stuff you were tested on to do it. The ideal, though, is that you may want to try something different **tomorrow**. Why in the world do you want to not only discourage that, but make it illegal? Phone-only licenses serve no useful function, and just encourage people to use the most spectrum-hogging mode. If you can't bear to learn the code, then get the requirement removed if you can, but **don't** further carve up the license structure into mode-specific micro-classes.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: 12 Sep 1994 00:02:57 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!newshub.nosc.mil!crash!news.sprintlink.net!

jupiter.planet.net!earth.planet.net!billsohl@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael Silva (mjsilva@ted.win.net) wrote:

: >What is wrong with the proposal of opening the HF Phone bands to people
: >who pass 5wpm CW and are capable of passing all the written tests through
: >extra class? This would certainly reverse the dumbing-down of ham radio and
: >would not be encroaching on your precious CW bands. Some might even grow
: >to like CW, like I do, and pass the 13wpm test later for CW privileges.
: >

: What purpose is served by allowing these engineering wizards access to
: HF phone? Is HF phone really the cutting edge? How are they going to
: apply their engineering talents there? Seems to me that they'd just be
: wasting time jawboning when they should be applying their technical
: prowess, which gained them their special entry status, by expanding the
: frontiers of the hobby, which are VHF/UHF/SHF. But wait, don't we
: already *have* a license for that?

: Furthermore, it really makes no sense to pass a CW test to get access
: to band segments where nobody is working CW.
: Mike, KK6GM

Which is exactly the point that several of us have been espousing...
why have a 13/20 wpm CW requirement for HF band segments where CW
is not the mode being used?

--

Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)
Budd Lake, New Jersey

Date: Fri, 9 Sep 1994 13:04:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!nntp-server.caltech.edu!netline-
fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!
news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <940907164954178@digcir.cts.com>, <34ndlg\$cbg@chnews.intel.com>,
<34nsi2\$r26@crcnis1.unl.edu>.go
Subject : Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an

In <34nsi2\$r26@crcnis1.unl.edu> gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>Actually, Cecil, you can actually do that. Many of us have.
>Besides using international Q signals, the very fact that morse is
>slower gives people with limited language skills a little more time to
>think of how to say something. I can carry on a very reasonable
>contact in Spanish in CW, but doing so by voice is quite a different
>story.

Reasonable contact between two hams using CW who speak entirely
different languages: Exchange of call signs and signal reports
followed by 73. It's amazing what passes for intelligent
conversation on the HF bands. Makes we want to immediately
run out and take that 20 WPM test. Not!

I guess that's what passes for international good-will. ;-)

--

```
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com |  
{      }/ Marquette Electronics, Inc | Time for another tea party!  
\      / Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA |  
|__*| N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio |
```

Date: 10 Sep 1994 03:20:54 GMT
From: informatik.tu-muenchen.de!lrz-muenchen.de!colin.muc.de!ftp.space.net!stasys!
sungy!uk-usenet.uk.sun.com!brinkley.East.Sun.COM!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!
abyss.West.Sun.COM!bigboy!@zib-berlin.de
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <34put3\$8th@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <34qfhm\$et8@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<34qhhd\$fo3@crcnis1.unl.edu>e.edu
Subject : Re: Morse code as a common language? (was Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an

In article <34qhhd\$fo3@crcnis1.unl.edu> gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)
writes:

>
>In re-reading this post, I feel I need to clarify: The "very good
>point" I said that Dana made was what I underlined for emphasis:
>
>"Morse code is the only encoding method which is practical to be
>encoded and decoded by a human operator without the use of machinery".
>
>This alone seems to me to be a very "compelling" argument in favor of
>keeping the requirement! One of the essential goals of true emergency
>preparedness is to reduce the reliance on technologically complicated
>tools/machinery. Certainly use them if available, but don't rely on
>them. What more elegant support of the code requirements than the
>above observation by Dana?

This "emergency preparedness" theme ignores reality; the simple fact is
that the vast majority of emergency communications take place using
voice or automated digital modes, not Morse code. In particular,
when the amateur radio service is called upon to offer operators
and equipment to emergency services, there are many people involved
that are not amateurs and don't know Morse code. Voice is the mode
of preference. Furthermore, emergency preparedness means being prepared
to operate during an emergency, not prepared to cobble some kind of
rudimentary one-way transmitter together. The "code is so simple it
makes it easy to be prepared for an emergency" argumnet is based in
romance and fiction, not the 1990s.

Sure, I "eloquently" said that Morse code is the only digital mode practical for humans to practice without machinery. But, the bottom line is, the trained operators that emergency services want are operators trained in voice, that can work with other people that don't know code. Suggesting that knowing code somehow makes a difference for the unprepared amateur in an emergency is ridiculous; an amateur is either prepared or not, and it doesn't have to do with knowing code.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

Date: 13 Sep 1994 01:26:48 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!unlinfo.unl.edu!
gbrown@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <34qihs\$9b7@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <34rbf6\$jun@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<091294171424Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>s1.u

Subject : Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

: >Now, the relevance of this (the rest of my post) is that, for much of
: >the rest of the world, CW (morse) is one of the two dominant modes in
: >use, and of the two (SSB and CW), CW (morse) is the only one which
: >facilitates communication among hams who share no common language
: >other than IMOAS (International Morse Operators' Abbreviations and
: >Shorthand). (Remember International goodwill...emergency
: >preparedness...communication...all that good stuff?)

: Which does not require use of manual morse to use that short hand. In fact
: it is used every day in all voice modes. Manual morse decoding testing is
: not required to use the Philips (as Jeff pointed out) Q-Codes.

No, it isn't, Dan! If you think you heard someone else say that, it was me. Remember? First, we weren't just talking about the Q codes,

which ARE used on voice, but the customary abbreviations (tnx, om, fb, wx, es, c, etc., etc.) You can not use those effectively on any voice mode. YES, you can use them on other digital modes, but please tell me what other digital mode is as wide spread (in the rest of the world...as well as the US) as "manually encoded and decoded" (as you call it) morse CW??? Until the other digital modes are as widespread and available as CW Morse, it will still be the best mode for communication with other amateurs in the world, and still worth requiring on our exams for HF access.

Anonymous (I do not speak for Gregory Brown...he retired)

Date: Tue, 13 Sep 1994 01:55:02 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.3897.2427@channel1.com>, <Cw05KA.Kzt@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<091294160451Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>na
Subject : Re: Facts Speak volumes

In article <091294160451Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>

>But Jeff, your main argument for continuing TESTING (the purpose of this
>discussion dispite your attempts to draw it AWAY from TESTING!) is a pool
>of trained radio operators. If there is not futher need for the pool
>(except in the "ham service") then we need no longer test for it.

First off, sheesh Dan.

The pool of trained operators provides for improving the technical climate of our society. Young pups that start off as hams will generally continue into technical careers as adults *if* they learn building and repair skills.

Buying a radio and talking doesn't give one any technical expertise (11M is a good example); it is the knowledge gained by actually *building* and repairing and modifying and designing that one can use towards a career in a technical area.

Deleting the code requirement will help to prevent the new ham from thinking about constructing a radio. You've doomed our new ham to a life of operating store-bought radios, and possible kept him from a technical career. Shame on you, Dan!

Talk to the OT'ers who are today working for GE, Motorola, RCA,
and for other communication industries and I'm sure you'll find
many started out as hams building much of their own equipment.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 10 Sep 1994 03:09:49 GMT

From: informatik.tu-muenchen.de!lrz-muenchen.de!colin.muc.de!ftp.space.net!stasys!
sungy!uk-usenet.uk.sun.com!brinkley.East.Sun.COM!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!
abyss.West.Sun.COM!bigboy!@zib-berlin.de
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <34prlu\$ekm@news.iastate.edu>, <34put3\$8th@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,
<34qfhm\$et8@crcnis1.unl.edu>rest
Subject : Re: Morse code as a common language? (was Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an

In article <34qfhm\$et8@crcnis1.unl.edu> gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)
writes:

>Dana Myers (myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com) wrote:

>

>: So, Morse code isn't a common language, despite claims to the contrary
>: by the Morse romantics, but International Morse code forces the use of
>: a common character set. Maybe the argument is really "International
>: Morse code is a common character set".

>

>No, morse code is not in itself a language. But morse ham operators,
>regardless of native language, communicate using a common language of
>abbreviations which most international hams understand. The point has
>been made before: "Mni Tnx fer FB QSO. CUAGN 73" etc., _can_ be
>understood by nearly every CW operator, regardless if s/he can speak
>English or not. It is a limited language, but it does allow
>communication where it would otherwise be impossible.

>

>: In fact, this advantage of International Morse code is also found in
>: ASCII communications. So, the "it is a common character set" argument
>: could easily be made for ASCII (as well as Baudot, and the other
>: digital modes...

>

>Certainly it could. But I have yet to see the other digital modes
>routinely use this "international language" (CW-type abbreviations),
>although there is no reason they could not.

I guess you don't operate packet too much, then, Greg. I frequently see
these abbreviations in use on packet, both HF and above. I've even
seen them used in international packet conversations.

```
>: Indeed, this leaves us with one real advantage of Morse code over other
>: digital encodings:  Morse code is the only encoding method which is
>      ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>: practical to be encoded and decoded by a human operator without the use
>      ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>: of machinery (at fairly low speeds).  I guess this makes Morse code
>      ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>: very attractive to many people, but how does it make it compelling as a
>: requirement?
>
>That is a _very_ good point, Dana. A _very_ _very_ good point.
>Think about it.  It is also the only mode which:  Currently shares a
>common language (International Morse Operators' Abbreviations and
>Shorthand) (Dana, as an Extra, you probably already know IMOAS!); is
>readily accessible to (and used _by_) hams in less
>economically/technologically advanced countries; is currently the best
>_internationally available_ mode for weak signal communications.
```

No, I only said Morse code is the only encoding method practical for humans to perform. The "common language" shows up in other digital modes, this isn't some unique advantage of Morse code. The "less developed" countries aren't populated by grass-clad natives in mud huts; while many people do not operate digital modes other than packet, it is likely a matter of personal financial choice. Morse does have utility in weak signal work, but the hardcore weak signal people inevitably end up using machines. have a look at QEX from a few months ago; the people doing the ZRO test ended up using some pretty sophisticated hardware and software to demodulate the weakest signals.

```
>Note the use of the adjective "currently". Things change. Someday CW
>(code) proficiency may no longer be utilitarian...like "spark". But
>today, at least internationally, it still appears to be.
```

Appears to be; it appears to me that Morse code is a delightful relic of days past. I'm all for people using it, heck, I use it. But it is time for the amateur community to recognize that time marches on, and we aren't some museum of radio history. If Morse code is advantageous, it will not be necessary to require knowledge of it. People will use it when it is useful or recreational.

>It seems the arguments are all or nothing for those sub-bands where
>code is not normally used. Curious that the discussion has all been
>around lowering or eliminating the code requirements for HF access,
>but not for making only a select few phone sub-bands available (as the
>Novices and Tech-Plus's have on 10M). Just curious.

I've suggested, several times, that replacing the Morse requirements

with advanced tests on a selection of specific topics, is a fair way to satisfy the "something for nothing" traditionalists, while acting to help further the technical or operating focus of the service. Keep in mind that Morse code knowledge would still be a valid "advanced test".

Critics seem to either attack this notion, or ignore. It is too close to a real, workable compromise that many of the extremists refuse to even look. But, offering a way for people that have advanced skills related to the ever broadening radio art to join in with whatever incentive the licensing system offers, makes sense. However, it means the traditionalists would have to accept skills other than Morse code prowess as being equally related.

As for wanting something for nothing, that's not my motivation; I'm looking at how the amateur service can grow into the future, not wallow in the past.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #440
